

## DUG Meeting Minutes

### Portland, Oregon USFS/BLM Office, May 8-9, 2007

Meeting called to order on May 8, at 8:40 am by Kirk Halford.

Two notions were forwarded as themes for the meeting; “Ground Up” and “Engagement”

Attendees (22)

Eric Allison	California OHP	916 653-7278	<a href="mailto:ealli@parks.ca.gov">ealli@parks.ca.gov</a>
Bill Doleman	New Mexico HPD ARMS	505 776-1277	<a href="mailto:billdoleman@state.nv.us">billdoleman@state.nv.us</a>
Sandra Arnold	BLM Yuma FO (AZ)	928 317-3239	<a href="mailto:Sandra_Arnold@blm.gov">Sandra_Arnold@blm.gov</a>
Susan Lyn White	Oregon SHPO	503 986-0675	<a href="mailto:Susan.White@state.or.us">Susan.White@state.or.us</a>
Matt Dierderich	Oregon SHPO	503 986-0577	<a href="mailto:Matthew.Dierderich@state.or.us">Matthew.Dierderich@state.or.us</a>
Chris Arthur	BLM Casper FO (WY)	307 261-7501	<a href="mailto:Chris_Arthur@blm.gov">Chris_Arthur@blm.gov</a>
Glenda King	Idaho SHPO	208 334-3847	<a href="mailto:Glenda.King@ishs.idaho.gov">Glenda.King@ishs.idaho.gov</a>
Jason Strahl	BLM Dillon FO (MT)	406 683-8033	<a href="mailto:Jason_Strahle@blm.gov">Jason_Strahle@blm.gov</a>
Deidre McCarthy	National Park Service	202 352-2141	<a href="mailto:Deidre_Mccarthy@nps.gov">Deidre_Mccarthy@nps.gov</a>
Tom Burke	BLM NVSO	775 861-6415	<a href="mailto:tlburke@nv.blm.gov">tlburke@nv.blm.gov</a>
Bill Hedman	BLM Central Yukon FO (AK)	907 267-1293	<a href="mailto:whedman@blm.gov">whedman@blm.gov</a>
Joan Dale	Alaska OAHP	907 269-8718	<a href="mailto:joan.dale@alaska.gov">joan.dale@alaska.gov</a>
Stan McDonald	BLM IDSO	208 373-9043	<a href="mailto:Stan_Mcdonald@blm.gov">Stan_Mcdonald@blm.gov</a>
Richard Brook	BLM WO 240	202 452-0326	<a href="mailto:rbrook@blm.gov">rbrook@blm.gov</a>
Dan Martin	BLM WO 240	303 236-0105	<a href="mailto:Dan_Martin@blm.gov">Dan_Martin@blm.gov</a>
Mary Hopkins	Wyoming SHPO	307 766-5324	<a href="mailto:Hopkins@uwyo.edu">Hopkins@uwyo.edu</a>
Karyn deDufour	Nevada SHPO	775 684-3447	<a href="mailto:kmddedufo@clan.lib.nv.us">kmddedufo@clan.lib.nv.us</a>
Monica Weimer	BLM Royal Gorge FO (CO)	719 268-8557	<a href="mailto:Monica_Weimer@co.blm.gov">Monica_Weimer@co.blm.gov</a>
Donna Day	USFS Eldorado NF (CA)	530 478-6214	<a href="mailto:dday@fs.fed.us">dday@fs.fed.us</a>
Eric Ingbar	Gnomon, Inc.	775 885-2305 x201	<a href="mailto:eingbar@gnomon.com">eingbar@gnomon.com</a>
Scott Goodman	BLM Prineville FO (OR)	541 416-6760	<a href="mailto:hgoodman@or.blm.gov">hgoodman@or.blm.gov</a>
Kirk Halford	BLM Bishop FO (CA) and National Data Steward	760 872-5030	<a href="mailto:khalford@ca.blm.gov">khalford@ca.blm.gov</a>
Kristen Jensen	Utah Div. Of State History	801 533-3526	<a href="mailto:kjensen@utah.gov">kjensen@utah.gov</a>

Introductions by each attendee.

Some comments from individuals during their introductions:

Get USFS and BLM on same page (Donna)

Focus on problem solving not data (Monica)

It takes more than money, it takes convincing (Tom)

It's a ground-up initiative: it has to work in the field (Kirk)

Brief agenda review

Stan: Is the heading Strategic Business Plan an indicator that a written business plan will be created, a written.

*(EI thought on this – really good question. We should return to this at the end of the meeting. If needed Kirk and I could work on a written strategic plan.*

### **PERMITTING STANDARDS**

Discussion on Permitting Standard changes. Handout: proposed changes to wording in “Standard Permit Conditions” sections q and s.

Joan: GPS works poorly in Alaska compared to competent field plots.

Mary: Rapid implementation will be hampered by the training and requirements that will fall on the field offices and the consultants. It will be a workload issue for field offices and SHPOs.

Kirk: Training, training, training....

Monica: We have to force the issue or change will never happen. This may be especially true for the field offices.

Stan: Who would train the field office staff? Don't they have to be the quality control gateway? Will they have time, capabilities, etc., to do this?

Dan: There is training available – especially to agency staff, but even to contractors working for an agency.

Kristen: It's my job to provide them the tools, but not to require it of contractors. I want to make these tools so attractive that they want to use them. If you require it of people, then data quality will suffer.

Mary: Implementation plan for permit standards is needed.

Sandra: This would give me a tool to enforce contractors providing quality information.

Donna: USFS has had a GPS requirement for some years in many forests. Contractors have not complained. USFS will move forward with requiring site information in digital format. It's a budget issue for USFS – there is no time or money for data entry or GIS.

Karyn: A quick summary of what is proposed (electronic submissions) should be included.

Task group on permitting (draft members): Eric, Kirk, Mary, Dan Martin, Tom Burke, Eric Allison

Discussion lasted until 10:00. short break until 10:10

Agenda Change: Moved up Budget Presentation by Richard Brook. Interstate cooperative efforts will be combined with CRMTracker discussion later.

## **BUDGET DISCUSSION**

Richard gave a brief history of the funds for the CRDSP. He brought up several new funding potentials that are being pursued (or should be pursued): right of way / lands, challenge cost share, and for the Energy Policy Act states funds from those pilot offices).

Remarkable that we have been able to hold on to \$350,000 in annual allocation for CRDSP.

700-900k acres per year are inventoried by BLM – about 700k of federal land, and then associated state, etc., lands

Recording \_\_\_\_\_ sites per year.

Mary: we are attacking this in many different ways. The difficulty is not in getting folks to understand it. They get it. The difficulty is in getting them to find the money and commit it.

Stan: There are also statewide funded initiatives (at least in Idaho). These are another potential source of funding.

Some discussion about the need to prove up the cost-efficacy of CRDSP. For instance, we need (and will be requesting) annual summaries of how states spend their CRDSP and what other funding, activities, partnerships and products are produced each year.

Task Force (*ei idea, not discussed formally*): *Create a format for a CRDSP annual report.*

Richard: Identify the proportion of backlog that is created in each (your) SHPO office because of BLM activities.

Stan: Can we identify key communication needs to field managers so that in the budget strategy teams they see the funding opportunities for CRDSP. For instance, the state office planning team may know when a major planning effort will occur, part of which could be data creation, update, etc.

Karyn: Discussion of reserving \$5-10K/year for data reps. Also, SHPO's should not stop counting match at 1:1, the new annual summary will help to determine that ratio. Also, RMP's should be funding/updating GIS layers.

Lunch break 11:30 – 12:45

Return 1:50 – **Discussion on CRMTracker and other shared tools.**

CRMTracker was discussed as a platform or precedent for sharing between states.

Mary: A digitization or submission portal might be the next step so that everyone can QC and especially submit records in the same way is important. Can we spend some time on defining products?

Dan: We need an electronic environment in which we can exchange information. Dan offered to work on this.

Kristen: We need more of a buffet approach to tools. States can pick and choose which components work for them, rather than having a series of top-down tools pushed at them.

There seemed to be some general agreement about this.

Some states are just not ready.

Deidre: Having a standard does not mean that everyone must use the same application(s) to meet the standard.

Product ideas:

- A digitizing portal
- Data entry and integrated data management
- Document management systems
  - Alaska uses CoFax
- Standards-based programming
- What Utah is up to...
- GIS attributing tools
- Web based data entry tools
- Document management system
- Staff training and consultant training
- Built environment process and training
- Data models
- High level overview of different systems
- CRISP

Karyn: Think of this as concepts, products, and gizmos. Broken down by Karyn as:

<b>Concepts</b>	<b>Systems</b>	<b>Gizmo's</b>
Trainings	Tracker	Digitizer
Data Models	INFRA	“there may be more gizmo’s”
Standards	AzSite	
Data Dictionaries	NMCRIS	
	NVCRIS	
	Utah’s DB	
	Portals	

There was some discussion of INFRA and its use as a corporate data system. Donna talked about how INFRA does interchange with some states (New Mexico, Oregon is in progress). Training is about 2.5 to 3.5 days. USFS is supplying the field DPR software either on government supplied equipment or as installable software that runs on any Windows CE system.

## **GIS Standards**

Presented, discussed and reviewed. Adopted by voice vote.

## **NPS Standards**

OMB Circular A-16 mandates standards per FGDC, appoints NPS as lead agency for cultural resources metadata.

NPS standards at the dataset level follow those proposed to and adopted by this group, with one other dataset model difference. This difference consists of separating the resource identifiers from the resource location identifiers (they are modeled as distinct entities). In the NPS schema then, there is a table of resource identifiers and a table of resource locations. These are keyed together.

NPS draft standards are on the NPS website as of October 2006.

[http://www.nps.gov/gis/data\\_standards](http://www.nps.gov/gis/data_standards)

<http://www.cr.nps.gov/hdp/crgis>

Deidre can send the presentation and her data model. Data model and presentation can be posted on the DUG website.

Mary: The wording of the term “inventory” in the Preserve America Summit has a specific meaning.

Richard: The national inventory, as stated in the Preserve America Summit, had many meanings in the summit.

Deidre: The national inventory means “the list of properties known to exist”, but this changes on a daily basis. It does NOT mean doing on-the-ground inventory of cultural resources. One of the biggest problems has been that the inventory concept has not included the idea of geography.

## **Wednesday 5/9/2007**

Attendees – Richard Brook, Donna Day, Susan White, and Deidre McCarthy unable to attend. Otherwise, same as yesterday.

## **Data Access Policies and Issues**

California: No OHP access to electronic data. Information centers – 2 – can provide data in electronic form. They charge for this service. Anyone getting access to electronic data must sign a CHRIS confidentiality agreement.

Idaho: Must come to office, sign a confidentiality form. No check of federal permit. Information given out on basis of identified APE.

Nevada: Once in to NVCRIS, you can go anywhere.

New Mexico: Access is largely codified by regulation. These regulations include criteria for access to the records, most of which (?) must be met for access to be granted. The Registrar (ARMS Manager) can decide on access itself and the kind(s) of access that will be granted. So, for instance, there is a category of user called “assisted access” that is a one-project access

privilege (ARMS does the work for these folks and charges them for it). Unfettered access is granted to known, regular, users.

Long discussion on access to records. Some states do look at federal permits, some do not.

Kirk proposed a task group to compile what different SHPOs use as access criteria and standards.

Eric A.: What has been the process of setting access categories? These would be interesting to compile.

Karyn: I think something needs to be included/reiterated that BLM looks to the SHPO's to hold their data as a statewide, collaborative data set. Limiting access to data by land owner defeats the purpose of a collective database.

Eric I.: What would a survey of these standards look like?

**A table might look like this:**

Kind of information	Access Type	
	Assisted*	Unfettered
Statewide electronic data		
APE-specific electronic data		
GIS data extract		
Fee structures		

Kristen: We would like to avoid charging at all. The records should be a supported function of state government.

Mary: The problem is that user fees are inherently unpredictable, and this is not a good basis for continued service provision.

Access task group mandate: compile the access policies of the different states and the fee structures.

Members of task group: Karyn deDufour, Kristen Jensen, Bill Doleman, Joan Dale, Glenda King, Eric Allison

**Tribal Issues**

Bill D: A few tribes have asked if "their data" can be turned off. This is still in discussion. The Navaho do not participate in ARMS. They just send paper records and do not participate in site or project registration. Bill said they just are not being approached with access or restriction requests.

ARMS does have a capability to turn off the display of specific sites, but does not have the ability to block large areas. ARMS has turned off a few sites at the request.

Eric A.: CA has 114 Federally-recognized tribes. An additional list is maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. The OHP met with 45 tribes (the entire Heritage Commission list was invited) in February. The SHPO offered to remove any records for tribes from the CRIS. So far as Eric knows, no one asked.

Bill and Joan: Alaska has over two hundred tribes, but also under ANCSA large areas of federal land were transferred to Native American corporations (village corporations, regional corporations) as fee simple. There are cases where tribes without land have had to request access to records for lands that they do not own (even if the property is owned by some other Native American corporation). Basically, Native Americans seeking information that is not on their land are treated like contractors.

### **Communications**

Dan presented a discussion of the forum and other tools.

We discussed facilitating communication – at some length. There seemed to be two needs: a mailing list for official members of the DUG (this could be a listserv or mailing list) and a forum. A DUG forum has too small a membership to gather postings or replies. So, if this forum is going to continue, it needs to have a much larger membership. For now, we agreed to play with the forum some more, holding on to it until such time as a direction (with more members) is found.

Eric Allison mentioned he could start a listserv for the CRDSP.

### **Mission Statement of the Cultural Resources Data Sharing Partnership**

Bill H. asked whether there is a mission or goals statement for the DUG. There is no mission statement for the DUG and we should create one.

Eric I. took a stab at a group definition, a vision statement and a mission statement, which the members discussed and further refined:

**Vision Statement:** Cultural resources professionals will have consistent, easy to use, information systems that assist them in doing their jobs as managers, researchers, and cultural professionals.

**Mission Statement for the DUG:** The DUG, through its members, will serve as a coordinating and facilitative group so that:

- To ensure that field users have appropriate tools to do their jobs
- Information systems are created in a consistent fashion
- Technology investments are sharable (and shared)
- Training and support is provided to information system users
- The use of information systems is promoted at the field level
- The development of information systems is pursued
- Information users have appropriate shared information to do their job
- Statistics and metrics are compiled consistently to measure progress

Decisions of the partnership are non-binding upon the partners, but serve as best practice recommendations. Within the BLM, the motions or recommendations of the partnership will be presented to the Preservation Board for formal action, implementation, or promulgation. All partners are encouraged to consider involvement of others in how motions or recommendations may best be implemented.

Partner Definition: The Partner agencies have Team Members who comprise the Partnership Team. The Team members are designated BLM and State Historic Preservation Office representatives. In general:

- Team Members are points of contact for information system management and development pertaining to shared cultural resource information systems.
- Team Members must participate actively in Partnership activities by attending teleconferences, meetings, etc. Attendance at an annual meeting by an organizational representative is required and must be part of annual budget planning.
- Team Members must serve as a contact for staff within their agencies, encouraging colleagues to use information systems and also gathering from them needs, requests, and concerns.
- Team Members are encouraged to consider that motions or recommendations of the Partnership might need discussion with other partner agencies, organizations, and constituencies.

BLM Team Members consist of:

WO-240 Staff and contractors as appointed by the Group Manager

A CRDSP Coordinator (may be WO-240 staff or from a state or field office)

From each state office, except the Eastern States Office:

- State Cultural Resources Lead (Deputy FPO)
- Data Steward (vested by default in the Deputy FPO, but by preference a field office staff member)

SHPO Team Members consist of:

- An appointed individual from each partner SHPO (by preference the person in charge of the SHPO information system)

### **Data Steward Definition**

Kirk: Push for \$10k of 1050 funds to be dedicated to the Data Steward time.

Tom: Link it to a target.

Monica: This would validate my role.

General discussion – would there be enough “free time” in a Steward’s field office? Or would they not be available at all, given the Steward’s work load. There was quite a bit of discussion about this. Tom opined that even with funding, a field office manager might well deny the request that a staff member be the state representative.

General agreement that the Steward role is important and should be continued. Stan pointed out that the term “Data Steward” is formally defined and should be changed. Some alternate terms are “Field Partner”, “State CR Data Manager”, “Deputy Data Lead”.



Karyn: Perhaps use Data Representative instead of Steward, 'cause Steward is a loaded term in BLM parlance.

Eric's vote: "CR Data Manager"

Note to Kirk and Eric: We should do an annual telecon with each Steward and Deputy FPO to assess how the CRDSP funds for the coming FY will be used. This is important because the data stewards are basically disenfranchised from the dollars distribution process in (at least) some states.

### **Looking Forward**

Discussion on annual meeting. Consensus is to have an annual meeting.

Conference calls should return to a quarterly schedule, but with a clear agenda that identifies information items, action items, and proposed action items for the next meeting. Round-robin updates will be avoided.

The Permit Task Group will be led by Kirk Halford. The Access Task Group will be led by Karyn deDufour.

There was some discussion on a strategic plan task group. Monica suggested that the Strategic Plan be part of each telephone call. So, strategic plan will be a work group item on each call. Goals and strategies will be the focus of the first call.

Meeting adjourned @ 5:00 p.m.